

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D 21 JUL 2005

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

WIPO PCT

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY
(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/GB2005/000149

International filing date (day/month/year)
17.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)
17.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G06F17/30

Applicant
NETWORK LIMITED

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☐ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas
Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl
Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Authorized Officer

Warry, L.

Telephone No. +31 70 340-3199



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/GB2005/000149

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority does not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where required, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.
2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Re Item V.

1.0 The following document is referred to in this communication:

D1: VOIGT K: "SKIPPER: a tool that lets browsers adapt to changes in document relevance to its user" RESEARCH ISSUES IN DATA ENGINEERING, 1996. INTEROPERABILITY OF NONTRADITIONAL DATABASE SYSTEMS. PROCEEDINGS. SIXTH INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON NEW ORLEANS, LA, USA 26-27 FEB. 1996, LOS ALAMITOS, CA, USA, IEEE COMPUT. SOC, US, 26 February 1996 (1996-02-26), pages 61-68, XP010157872 ISBN: 0-8186-7289-7

1.1 Claims 1 - 16 are not novel (Article 33(2) PCT).

1.2 Claims 1 - 16 are not inventive (Article 33(3) PCT).

1.3 Claims 1 - 16 are industrially applicable (Article 33(4) PCT).

2.0 Novelty (Article 33(2) PCT).

2.1 Document D1, which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art, discloses all the features of claim 1 (the references in parenthesis applying to this document):

- A method of providing specific usage related information directly to a computer user (Page 61, Right Column, Second Paragraph, "documents ... that are of apparent personal relevance");
- Providing a dedicated user interface for Internet usage by a computer user (Page 61, Right Column, Second Paragraph, "personalizes browsing");
- Monitoring the Internet usage by the computer user through the dedicated user interface (Page 62, Left Column, Third Paragraph, "Detection and quantification of relevance from raw usage data");

- identifying specific information relevant to the Internet usage by the computer user;
- Modifying the dedicated user interface dependent on the Internet usage by the user, to provide access to the identified information (Page 64, Left Column, Second Paragraph, "Personalizing the presentation of browser options").

2.1.1 The subject-matter of claim 1 is therefore not novel (Article 33(2) PCT).

2.2 Since independent claim 9 has a one-to-one correspondence of features, the same objection applies mutatis mutandis. Therefore, claim 9 is also not novel (Article 33(2) PCT).

2.3 Dependent claims 2 - 8, 10 - 15 not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step because they are either disclosed or implied by D1.

2.4 Therefore, Claims 1 - 16 are not new according to Article 33(2) PCT.

3.0 Inventive Step (Article 33(3) PCT).

3.1 Since Claims 1 - 16 are not new (cf, §2.4), claims 1 - 16 are therefore also not inventive (Article 33(3) PCT).

4.0 Industrial Applicability (Article 33(4) PCT).

4.1 Claims 1-16 fall within the technical field of Internet Information Retrieval.



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas
Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl
Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Warry, L

Telephone No. +31 70 340-3199



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/GB2005/000149

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority does not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where required, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.
2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Re Item V.

1.0 The following document is referred to in this communication:

D1: VOIGT K: "SKIPPER: a tool that lets browsers adapt to changes in document relevance to its user" RESEARCH ISSUES IN DATA ENGINEERING, 1996. INTEROPERABILITY OF NONTRADITIONAL DATABASE SYSTEMS. PROCEEDINGS. SIXTH INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON NEW ORLEANS, LA, USA 26-27 FEB. 1996, LOS ALAMITOS, CA, USA, IEEE COMPUT. SOC, US, 26 February 1996 (1996-02-26), pages 61-68, XP010157872 ISBN: 0-8186-7289-7

1.1 Claims 1 - 16 are not novel (Article 33(2) PCT).

1.2 Claims 1 - 16 are not inventive (Article 33(3) PCT).

1.3 Claims 1 - 16 are industrially applicable (Article 33(4) PCT).

2.0 Novelty (Article 33(2) PCT).

2.1 Document D1, which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art, discloses all the features of claim 1 (the references in parenthesis applying to this document):

- A method of providing specific usage related information directly to a computer user (Page 61, Right Column, Second Paragraph, "documents ... that are of apparent personal relevance");
- Providing a dedicated user interface for Internet usage by a computer user (Page 61, Right Column, Second Paragraph, "personalizes browsing");
- Monitoring the Internet usage by the computer user through the dedicated user interface (Page 62, Left Column, Third Paragraph, "Detection and quantification of relevance from raw usage data");

- identifying specific information relevant to the Internet usage by the computer user;
- Modifying the dedicated user interface dependent on the Internet usage by the user, to provide access to the identified information (Page 64, Left Column, Second Paragraph, "Personalizing the presentation of browser options").

2.1.1 The subject-matter of claim 1 is therefore not novel (Article 33(2) PCT).

2.2 Since independent claim 9 has a one-to-one correspondence of features, the same objection applies mutatis mutandis. Therefore, claim 9 is also not novel (Article 33(2) PCT).

2.3 Dependent claims 2 - 8, 10 - 15 not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step because they are either disclosed or implied by D1.

2.4 Therefore, Claims 1 - 16 are not new according to Article 33(2) PCT.

3.0 Inventive Step (Article 33(3) PCT).

3.1 Since Claims 1 - 16 are not new (cf, §2.4), claims 1 - 16 are therefore also not inventive (Article 33(3) PCT).

4.0 Industrial Applicability (Article 33(4) PCT).

4.1 Claims 1-16 fall within the technical field of Internet Information Retrieval.